

Reply-To: bu.edu!INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL
Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #954
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Thu, 30 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 954

Today's Topics:

military call signs.....etc.
My backyard, your backyard ...
Scanner Law Guide
WANTED!! IC-04AT MODS Please!!

Date: 29 Nov 89 17:22:55 GMT
From: oliveb!mipos3!pcocd2!jmasters@apple.com (Justin Masters ~)
Subject: military call signs.....etc.
Message-ID: <1295@mipos3.intel.com>

In article <1408@raybed2.UUCP> ewb@raybed2.UUCP (EUGENE BALINSKI) writes:
>In article <8911212358.AA17672@ti.com>, dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD)
writes:
>> Several people have correctly cited the freedom to listen to any radio
communications. I support that. However, Balinski asked about the aircraft home
base,
>> etc. While the radio transmissions he heard were obviously unclassified, the
>>association of the call signs with aircraft type, unit of assignment and home
>>base is classified information. That is why I asked why he was interested in
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>
> Classified information ?? ARE YOU SURE ?? Could this come under the
>heading of "GEE, I THINK it should be classified". An awful lot of things
>that people THINK are classified are not. Let me give you an example of
>why I believe you are wrong.

When I was in the Air Force as a crypto tech, we were told not to divulge anything, with the assumption that everything was being monitored. True, small pieces of information could be unclassified, but put together, they could divulge some information that could be considered harmful to the nations ability to maintain a strategic advantage.

There have been times that I've had to hang up the phone to keep someone from blabbing more than they already have.

[stuff about information gathering deleted]

> In my original posting I was only looking for similar info. NOTHING
>CLASSIFIED.

That may be true, but your piecing it together and putting it on the net in one piece may be a violation.

That can seem close minded, sure, but the basic idea is that if you want the info, you should hunt for it, not be given it.

>
>
>> Regards,
>> Dube Todd
>
>BTW For those who think my original posting was "DANGEROUS", you should
>see this months (DEC '89) Monitoring Times. It has a very nice article
>about NELLIS AFB, home of the STEALTH programs, along with some interesting
>frequencies !!
>
Oh really? I'll have to pick up a copy. :)

> 73
> Gene Balinski
>
> <STANDARD DISCLAIMER APPLIES>

(ditto for me)

Is my car the only one in America where | Justin "Ice Cream Monster" Masters
someone breaks in and turns up my radio |
every time I park? - Steven Wright | jmasters@fmdgr1.intel.com

Date: 30 Nov 89 13:29:24 GMT
From: vsi1!daver!lynx!neal@apple.com (Neal Woodall)
Subject: My backyard, your backyard ...
Message-ID: <6589@lynx.UUCP>

In article <2942@cpoint.UUCP> die@cpoint.UUCP (David I. Emery) writes:

>It seemed very clear to one poster that it was improper to make use of
>services transmitted over the airwaves (such as pay tv) to which
>one does not subscribe.

My point was that it is illegal to receive the services without *paying* for them. The point I was trying to make is that you have a right to receive anything, but that a victimization occurs if you receive a service that is intended as a revenue-generating product or service and you do not pay the fair market value for the service.

Say that XYS Company is in the business of broadcasting a signal over a satellite transponder that is intended for subscribers, and that the subscribers pay a fee to get the service. Say that the XYS Company's broadcast is a training program for police officers, and that XYS Company targets the satellite broadcast to police departments around the country. The departments pay for the service, and everyone is happy.

Now you come along and set up your satellite dish. You have the technical ability to receive the signal. Now, here is the "trick": Even though XYS Company does not target their broadcast at individual citizens, even though they do not intend that the show be watched by ordinary citizens, if you wish to receive their program, you have the right to do so. You have the right to receive the signal, even if XYS Company does not want you to, and you have this right because they are broadcasting the signal over the public's radio spectrum. The only caveat is that to be legal, you must pay for the program, just like the intended audience.

Think of it like a performance given in a public place: The group giving the performance may have a specific target audience in mind, and they may have advertised for a certain group of people to buy a ticket, but they cannot legally exclude any member of the public who may wish to attend....but everyone who attends, regardless of whether or not they are the intended audience, must pay for the show.

Since the XYS Company is using the public airwaves for its transmission, anyone who desires to receive must be allowed to receive the signal, but they must pay just like the intended audience.

Now, say that the XYS Company uses two-way commercial radios for its business communications. These signals go over the public airwaves, and the signals themselves are not part of the programming they offer to any target market as a revenue-generating service. In this case, any citizen has the right to receive the signals, and they DO NOT have to pay for them, because XYS Company does not expect anyone else or any other group to pay for them. These two-way communications are NOT a service offered for sale to any group. However, they are broadcast over the public's radio spectrum, so anyone in the public has a right to receive the signals.

In this case I would make an analogy to people carrying on a conversation in public. If two people are discussing something in public, and I overhear it, that is just the way it goes. Their conversation was not intended for sale, so I don't pay for it. They may not want me to hear it, but this is the risk you run when you discuss something in public.

>I find it hard to understand why if I have an absolute "right"
>to interpret voltages induced across my backyard aluminum that that
>"right" ends just because somebody has defined their communication
>as something I must pay for.

I hope this posting clears up any misunderstanding that you obviously had as regards my position on this issue.

Your "right to receive" does NOT end just because someone intends that certain programming be paid for by the receiver. You still have the "right to receive".....the program provider cannot stop you from receiving the signal, but you should pay for the service, just like the intended audience.

You have an absolute right, IMHO, to receive ANYTHING that is broadcast over the public's radio spectrum, but this does not mean that you can get away with not paying for certain services!

>.....then why is it not perfectly appropriate for Congress
>to define certain essentially private communications as restricted in the
>same sense as pay-for-reception transmissions are?

Again, IMHO, the only caveat in pay-for-reception is that you should pay for services that are intended as programming for revenue generation. The providers MAY NOT DENY YOUR RIGHT TO RECEIVE, but your right to receive does NOT guarantee that you can receive everything for FREE!

HOWEVER, you do have the right to receive anything that is broadcast over the public's airwaves. You cannot be denied the right to receive any signal that you can get into your antenna!

>Why, in short, should I have a right to listen to your phone calls but
>not watch HBO's video ?

You have the right to do BOTH....since I do not offer my cellular or cordless phone calls as a revenue-generating service, you do not have to pay for them. However, since HBO does offer their signal as a revenue generating service, you must pay for it if you receive it!

Neal

Date: 30 Nov 89 17:42:38 GMT
From: att!cbnewsc!parnass@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Bob Parnass, AJ9S)
Subject: Scanner Law Guide
Message-ID: <5154@cbnewsc.ATT.COM>

In article <14773@well.UUCP>, rh@well.UUCP (Robert Horvitz) writes:
>

> There's been so much discussion of the legal issues of scanning
> this month that it may be time to remind everyone that the
> "ANARC Guide to US Monitoring Laws" is the only current and
> complete collection of state scanner laws in print.

(I would post this followup to 'rec.radio.shortwave' also but
Bell Labs' netnews machines do not yet receive this newsgroup.)

I second Bob's recommendation. Here is a repost of my earlier
book review:

BOOK REVIEW: ANARC GUIDE TO U.S. MONITORING LAWS

by Bob Parnass, AJ9S

Do you as a monitoring hobbyist have the right to receive whatever radio signals you want in the privacy of your own home? No -- not any more. So say the infamous Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986 and a growing number of state laws which took away this freedom. You can find out about these restrictions in a new 39 page paperback, ANARC Guide to U. S. Monitoring Laws.

If you are new to the radio hobby, you might not be familiar with ANARC. ANARC is not a company. ANARC is the Association of North American Radio Clubs, a well intentioned umbrella organization of volunteers who look out for the best interests of shortwave and scanner listeners as well as TV, FM, and MW DXers. With the able Bob Horvitz at the helm, ANARC led the fight against ECPA, against FCC proposals to let Part 15 devices run hog wild over the spectrum, and other issues of concern to radio hobbyists.

The ANARC guide presents the text of the ECPA and the restrictive anti scanner laws of 14 states. Author Frank Terranella, ANARC's legal counsel and a radio hobbyist from New Jersey, does a good job of translating the legalese jargon into understandable English for the average person. He even cites a few real cases in which the laws were applied.

The guide sells for \$7.50, over 19 cents per page. This may seem expensive, but where else can you get all this legal information in one place? I've seen only one source which surveyed radio listening laws. Several years ago, before ECPA, Bearcat's SCAN organization pub-

lished a small pamphlet with very terse summaries of state scanner laws.

As the author laments in the foreword, "it is unfortunate that a guide such as this is necessary." Do you need this guide? I think you do. Before you bring a scanner along on vacation, you ought to know the scanner laws in the states through which you drive. Being a ham radio operator exempts you from Indiana's mobile scanner law, but it would be a good idea to carry a copy of the law in your car to show police if stopped. I recall when WA2PVK had a 19" whip on his car, and was stopped by a policeman in New Jersey to see if his car contained a scanner. New Jersey doesn't exempt hams.

The ECPA stirred up a hornet's net of protest, but hobbyists couldn't compete with powerful, well funded lobbyists. It's too late to argue against passage of ECPA -- it's law now. Several radio laws are difficult to understand and the hobby needs an author skilled in the legal profession and familiar with radio monitoring to explain them. This book suits the need well.

ANARC Guide to U.S. Monitoring Laws is available for \$7.50 from ANARC Publications, P.O. Box 462, Northfield, MN 55057.

--

=====

Bob Parnass, AJ9S - AT&T Bell Laboratories - att!ihuxz!parnass (708)979-5414

Date: 30 Nov 89 14:38:07 GMT
From: hpda!hpcuhb!hpscdc!marke@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Mark Espinosa)
Subject: WANTED!! IC-04AT MODS Please!!
Message-ID: <5490077@hpscdc.scd.hp.com>

The subject of "mod's" for the IC-04AT have probably been brought up before here on the NET, but for some reason I have managed to miss them all. So, if some kind ol radio amateur could dig in to his or her files one more time, and post them for me, it would be muchly apprieciated. I am specifically looking for the mod's that pertain to out of band operation, and RX audio volume improvement.

Please post or e-mail, and thanks.

Mark Espinosa/WA6RGD

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #954
